MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Central Intelligence

of the Agency proprietary organizations.

SUBJECT

: Employment of Retired Army Officer

REFERENCE

Memorandum for DCI from Assistant Director of Personnel

dated 16 November 1954

25X1A9a

1. We consur in conclusion that appoint- 25X1A9a

ment should be undertaken within the provisions of P. L. 53. The law

is not sufficiently explicit to say beyond a doubt that his appointment would be illegal if made other than through P. L. 53, but we think that the balance of legislative intent would be against any construction that would permit a clear distinction to be made between staff personnel used directly by the Agency and those employed under a cover contract by one

2. The so-called dual compensation law is found in several sections of the U. S. Code which must be read together. Section 59a provides for a \$3,000 limitation on an individual's right to receive retired pay when he also holds a "civilian office" or position under the U. S. Government or under any corporation, "the majority of the stock of which is owned by the United States". He may, however, make an election to accept either the retired pay or the pay of the civilian office or position. An exception is made for commissioned officers "retired for disability incurred in combat with an enemy of the United States or for disabilities resulting from an explosion of an instrumentality of war in line of duty". It seems to us extremely doubtful that Congress would have excluded a non-stock

is an earlier Act prohibiting the appointment "to any other office" with compensation when such person already holds an office with compensation amounting to \$2,500. It excludes officers "who have been retired for injuries received in battle or for injuries or incapacity incurred in line of duty". So reference is made to Government constraint of corporations. While some argument may be made that the "office" within the limitations imposed upon the Agency by Section 62 is not equivalent to the position held by retired officers in our proprietary corporations, we feel that the more conservative approach should be taken with regard to future personnel, tacitly reserving our argument to the contrary for those we have taken on board in the past. This approach would also provide full assurance to the individual under the personal limitations imposed upon them by Section 59a.